DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 219 061 IR 010 275

AUTHOR Warden, John W.; Kaplan, Michael H.
TITLE A Community Education Data Profile: Present and Future Data Needs at the Local Level. Research Report 81-105.
INSTITUTION Northern Inst. for Research, Training, and Development, Inc., Anchorage, Alaska.; Virginia Univ., Charlottesville. Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education.
SPONS AGENCY Mott (C.S.) Foundation, Flint, Mich.
PUB DATE Sep 81
NOTE 103p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Community Education; *Databases; Data Collection; *Decision Making; Educational Planning; *Financial Support; Futures (of Society); *Information Needs; Needs Assessment; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Resource Allocation; Surveys; Tables (Data)

ABSTRACT

Based on a perceived need for the development of a base of information for community education to appraise programs, to properly allocate financial support, and to support the decision making process, this study was conducted to determine the present level of data being collected by selected local education agencies and to determine the perceived data collection needs in the future. The cross section of 17 local education directors who participated represented rural and urban areas geographically dispersed throughout the country with a diversity of funding bases. The directors responded to a series of mailed inquiries about present data collection and to a questionnaire regarding future needs. Reported in terms of participation, activities, agency involvement, financial support, program support, and environmental factors, the findings provide a series of community education data profiles. Nine recommendations are made to the constituents of the community education field including local and regional agencies. Appendices contain a matrix on information presently collected at local level, the results of a future priorities questionnaire, a list of participating local agencies, the letter of invitation, a follow-up letter, and a sample letter regarding future data needs. A 21-item bibliography is included. (RAA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED219061

A COMMUNITY EDUCATION DATA PROFILE:

PRESENT AND FUTURE DATA NEEDS AT THE LOCAL LEVEL

Research Report 81-105

by

John W. Warden

Michael H. Kaplan

A collabrative project of

Mid-Atlantic Center For Community Education

University of Virginia

Charlottesville, Virginia

and

The Northern Institute For Research,
Training, and Development

Anchorage, Alaska

This study was supported by a grant from the C.S.Mott Foundation to the Mid-Atlantic Community Education Consortium (M.H.Kaplan, Principal Investigator, Research & Evaluation Component). The interpretations and conclusions contained in this publication represent the views of the authors and not necessarily those of the Mott Foundation, its trustees or officers.

September 1981

IR 010 275

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Larry E. Decker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Need For A Data Base In Community Education	2
II.	The Design Of The Study	5
III.	Findings	9
	A. Present Data	9
	B. Data Examples	15
	C. Future Data Needs	19
IV.	Discussion of the Findings	28
V.	Recommendations	36
VI.	References	40
VII.	Appendix	42

TABLES

Number	Title	Page
1.	Present data collected by major categories.....	10
2.	Present data collected by components.....	11
3.	Present data items mostly commonly collected.....	12
4.	Present data items with participation.....	12
5.	Present data items within activities category.....	13
6.	Present data items within involvement category.....	13
7.	Present data items within financial category.....	14
8.	Present data items within program support category....	14
9.	Highest priorities of future data needs.....	20
10.	Future data items within participation category.....	21
11.	Future data items within activities category.....	21
12.	Future data items within involvement category.....	22
13.	Future data items within financial category.....	22
14.	Future data items within program support category.....	23
15.	Future data items within environmental category.....	23
16.	Future data items within impact category.....	24
17.	Grand Mean scores of future data needs by category....	24
18.	Future data needs - educational programs for school age children.....	25
19.	Future data needs -use of facilities.....	25
20.	Future data needs - program for all ages.....	26
21.	Future data needs - community involvement.....	26
22.	Future data needs - delivery and coordination of community services.....	27

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to acknowledge the financial support made available through the contributions of the C.S. Mott Foundation to undertake this study. We would also like to extend a round of personal thanks to each of the following individuals and their organizations for contributing their time in assisting us to identify present and future data needs in community education. Their cooperation and involvement made this report possible. Thank you...

Jill Waters, Anchorage, Alaska
Gene Weber, Tucson, Arizona
Katha Cochoit, El Cajon, California
Katie Elsbree, Poway, California
John Zemlo, Gainesville, Florida
Lou Tasse, Miami, Florida
Harry Allen, Brockton, Massachusetts
Shirley Bryant, Birmingham, Michigan
Art Ingersoll, St. Louis, Minnesota
Jim Klassen, Roseville, Minnesota
Arlen Ticken, New Braunfels, Texas
Joe Allred, Wilkesboro, North Carolina
Skip Liebertz, Salem, Oregon
David Staton, Charleston, South Carolina
Del Highfield, Gloucester, Virginia
Jerry Dunlap, Tacoma, Washington
Mary Francis Bleidt, Charleston, West Virginia

I. NEED FOR A DATA BASE IN COMMUNITY EDUCATION

Over the past ten years a growing concern has been expressed regarding the need for the development of a base of information within the field of community education. Whitt (1971) and Van Voorhees (1972) were two early authors during the seventies who associated the collection of data with the need for accountability and research. A variety of other writers followed in the late seventies (Moore, 1974; Weaver & Seay, 1974; Hammond, 1978 and Burbach & Decker, 1977). All expressed concern about the lack of adequate data collected on community education efforts underway.

Two rather recent trends appear to be now operating which have accelerated the need for a base of information. One can be associated with the increasing contribution of public dollars to community education most noticeably through state and federal dollars. As public funds have increased, so too, have the accompanying requests for data on programs. The other trend has to do with the reduction in public dollars to social services presently taking place under the leadership of the Reagan administration. As the reduction in dollars continues,increasing pressure has been placed upon all social service organizations (including education) to prove "their worth". These two trends would appear to place community education in a very precarious position during the emerging 1980's.

Community educators need not feel alone in this position. One author (Bina, 1978) had noted the evolution of fifty-five (55)

national data bases related to education alone. Each is attempting to design a system to maximize the use of information for the advantage of its constituents. While most are designed for use with computers, one author (Bearly, 1979) had attempted to demonstrate how non-procedural languages for information resource management can be used effectively.

A data base system is indeed often associated with computers and programmers. The terminology "data base" may even sound foreign to many of us. Yet, accoring to Date (1981) a data base system is nothing more than a repository for stored data. The information can be anything that is deemed to be of significance to the organization the system is serving. In other words, anything that may be necessary to the decision-making processes involved in the management of that organization. The key is the storage of operational data which can be used at the appropriate time.

The advantages of such a data base system are rather straightforward. As Date (1981) has noted, a data base system can:

. improve decision making

. reduce redundancy in data collection

. data can be shared

. integrity can be maintained.

For community educators the evolution of a data base system can also mean a wide range of users tapping into the system.

Perhaps the strongest case for a data base in community education has been detailed by Gansneder et al. (1980) in a publication entitled Toward A Data Base For Community Education: An Exploratory Design.

While one might assume that community educators already recognize this need, the publication for the first time documented this need in detail. The authors also offered an excellent conceptual framework for a data base design. Elsewhere (Kaplan, Gansneder and Rochen, 1980) argued for the development of a multi-dimensional, modular data base for community education which would have utility at the local level as well as the governmental level, i.e. universities and departments of education. The intent would be to provide information which will be useful to the local operational program level as well as address fundamental research questions regarding the impact of community education.

II. DESIGN OF STUDY

The purposes of this study were two fold. First, to determine the present level of data being collected by selected local education agencies. This phase of the project was directed toward discovering the present "state-of-the-art" with regard to data collection. The second purpose was to determine the perceived data collection needs of the future within these same local education agencies.

A cross section of twenty (20) local community education directors were contacted for their involvement in the study. Their programs represented both rural and urban areas as well as a broad geographic representation from various regions of the country. Programs were selected with diversity in funding bases (federal, state, local) as well as diversity in institutional affiliations of the prime sponsor. A final criterion was the selection of key leaders of community education at the local education level who had extensive knowledge and experience in community education and were likely to support and respond to a study of this scope.

Phase I: Present Data Collected

A letter was mailed to the adiministrators of all twenty (20) perspective programs. The letters outlined the purposes of the study and requested the assistance of local administrators in two possible ways. (See Appendix D). Administrators were asked to either 1) list those data items collected on at least an annual basis at the present time or 2) send copies of all such data items and reports for analysis by the project staff.

An initial matrix was developed from this information listing

all data items and all project responses. This matrix was designed as a working draft in an attempt to gain a better perspective on the kind of data presently collected as well as the frequency with which these data were collected across programs.

This initial matrix was then mailed out to each participating administrator with the instructions to modify the matrix to reflect the actual data collected at the local level. This was done to enable local program administrators to react to data collected by other programs and more accurately depict their data collection efforts. It was also designed for verification purposes. Seventeen (17) or 85 percent of the local program administrators completed the initial matrix on present data collected.

A final revised matrix was then developed based upon this input (see Appendix A). This matrix included all data items with responses from all participating program administrators. It also included the total number of programs which collected each specific data item and the corresponding percentage of the total population which this figure represents. This information has been used to develop a profile of the kind of data most often collected at the local level and reported in the next section.

Phase II: Future Data Needs

A questionnaire was designed to collect information on perceived future data needs. Items for this questionnaire were derived from the following sources:

1. those items which local program listed as presently

collected (all items in Phase I matrix).

2. items from federally requested data (Local Data Monitoring form developed by Developmental Associates, 1979)
3. impact items listed from a review of the community education literature and Mid-Atlantic Center research publications (Gansneder et al., 1980,b).
4. environmental items listed by Mid-Atlantic research and evaluation publications (Schwartz et al., 1980).

A five-point scale was developed to reflect weighted responses to the perceived importance of collecting each data item in the future. Respondants were given the following response categories:

1. superficial
2. of little importance
3. useful
4. highly important
5. survival data.

One of the key points outlined in Gansneder, et al. (1980,b) was the need for local programs to discriminate on the kind of data most needed at the local level. According to the report, only then can boundaries of the information system be set and parameters chosen to deal with constraints related to time, user expertise and dollar expenditures.

The future priorities data questionnaire (see Appendix B) was mailed to all participating program administrators. Fourteen

(14) or seventy percent (70%) responded to the future questionnaire. Results were then tabulated and are reported in the next section.

III. FINDINGS

Listed below are the results of the study related to present data collected and future data needs.

A. Present Data Collected

Breadth & Range - The seventeen (17) program administrators participating in this phase of the study, reported presently collecting data in two hundred and eight (208) different areas. These data were arranged into the following major categories.

Participation: data related to actual number of participants, hours of participation and participation of selected variables.

Activities: data related to number of programs and activities, frequency of programs, cancelled activities, programs by selected variables.

Involvement: data related to volunteer involvement, advisory council data, agency involvement.

Financial: data related to funding - amounts and sources, operating expenses, costs per site, cost-benefit analysis, longitudinal data comparison.

Program Support: data related to goal/objective accomplishments, facilities utilized, planning data, staff data, participant evaulation data, state and federal requested data.

Environmental: data related to role development and change, organizational climate assessment, facility needs, demographic information.

Impact: data related to actual outcomes, such as personal success stories, skill attainments, agency benefits, number of requests for services filled.

The following profile of the present data collected emerged from this framework.

COMMUNITY EDUCATION DATA PROFILE:

PRESENT DATA COLLECTION BY MAJOR CATEGORIES

Table 1

Category	Number Items	Percentage of Total
Program Support	56	26.9
Involvement	46	22.1
Activities	29	13.9
Environmental	29	13.9
Participation	18	8.7
Financial	15	7.2
Impact	15	7.2
Total	208	99.9

In an attempt to get a better picture on the breadth of the data presently collected at the local level, the data items were also organized into major "component" areas often accociated with community education (Minzey & LeTarte, 1979). Components dealing with additional programs for school age children and youth and programs for adults were combined into one category on the following page (additional programs for all ages).

COMMUNITY EDUCATION DATA PROFILE:

PRESENT DATA COLLECTION BY COMPONENTS

Table 2

Major Component	Number Items	Percentage of Total
Additional programs for all ages	55	36.4
Community involvement	38	25.2
Delivery and coordination of community services	29	19.2
Educational program for school age children	20	13.2
Use of facilities	9	6.0
Total	151*	100

*The remaining 57 items did not fall into any of the major component categories.

Most Commonly Collected Data - Following are those individual data items that are presently collected by at least seventy percent (70%) of the local programs responding. These data reflect a profile of the most commonly collected data.

COMMUNITY EDUCATION DATA PROFILE:

PRESENT DATA ITEMS MOST COMMONLY COLLECTED

Table 3

Data Item & Number	Percentage of LEAs Collecting Data
Grand total number of participants (n.17)	100
Grand total number of programs (n.17)	100
Grand total number of participants by age (n.14)	82
Grand total number of participants by attendance area (n.14)	82
Number agencies/organizations using school facilities (n.14)	82
Total operating expenses (n.13)	76
Local funding source/amounts (n.13)	76
Other funding sources/amounts (n.12)	71
List of cooperating agencies (n.12)	71
Council data (general) (n.12)	71
State or federally requested data (n.12)	71

A profile of the data collected by at least fifty percent (50%) of the local programs is listed in Tables 4-8 according to major data categories. The information is designed to give the reader a better understanding of the kind of specific data collected within each of these major categories.

COMMUNITY EDUCATION DATA PROFILE:

PRESENT DATA ITEMS WITHIN PARTICIPATION CATEGORY

Table 4

Participation Data Item	Percentage of LEAs Collecting Data
Grand total number of participants (n.17)	100
Grand total number of participants by age (n.14)	82
Grand total number of participants by attendance area (n.14)	82
Individual activity rosters (n.9)	53

COMMUNITY EDUCATION DATA PROFILE:

PRESENT DATA ITEMS WITHIN ACTIVITIES CATEGORY

Table 5

Activities Data Item	Percentage of LEAs Collecting Data
Grand total number of programs (n.17)	100
Number of co-sponsored agency programs (n.11)	65
Number of educational programs (n.10)	59
Class meeting days (n.9)	53
Number of credit/non-credit programs (n.9)	53
Number of special events (n.9)	53
Number of meetings of each activity (n.9)	53
Activity meeting days (n.9)	53

COMMUNITY EDUCATION DATA PROFILE:

PRESENT DATA ITEMS WITHIN INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY

Table 6

Involvement Data Item	Percentage of LEAs Collecting Data
Number agencies/organizations using school facilities (n.14)	82
List of cooperating agencies (n.12)	71
Council data (general) (n.12)	71
Total number of volunteers (n.11)	65
Number of participants in other agency sponsored activities (n.11)	65
Council attendance figures (n.10)	59
Total volunteer hours (n.9)	53
Council meeting dates (n.9)	53

COMMUNITY EDUCATION DATA PROFILE:

PRESENT DATA ITEMS WITH FINANCIAL CATEGORY

Table 7

Financial Data Item	Percentage of LEAs Collecting Data
Total operating expenses (n.13)	76
Local funding sources and amounts (n.13)	76
Other funding sources and amounts (n.12)	71
Total cost of community education by site (n.10)	59
Total revenue by site (n.9)	53
Net cost per school (n.9)	53
Total expense/income by program or activity areas (n.9)	53

COMMUNITY EDUCATION DATA PROFILE:

PRESENT DATA ITEMS WITH PROGRAM SUPPORT CATEGORY

Table 8

Program Support Data Item	Percentage of LEAs Collecting Data
State or federally requested data	71
District goal/objective accomplishments	65
Facilities utilized	65
Staff evaluation data	65
Participant evaluation data	59
Local programs site goal and objective accomplishment	59
Narrative information on activities related to K-12	59
Narrative information on activities related to interagency cooperation	59
Number of designated community schools	53

Only one item under the environmental category was collected by at least half of the participating programs. This data item concerned the collection of demographic information on the community school attendance area. No data items under the impact category were collected by a majority of the participating programs. See Appendix A for complete listing of all data items in each category.

B. Data Examples

A variety of data collection areas deserve special emphasis. Many of these areas are either unique or could serve as models for data collection elsewhere.

Cost-Benefit Analysis - Four programs indicated the collection of cost-benefit analysis data. One such example is data collected in the Gloucester County Department of Community Education located in Gloucester, Virginia. Through the use of a series of questions related to agency investments, user investments and agency benefits, a formula has been designed to calculate the additional dollars in services due to interagency collaboration efforts. A list of specific questions related to the cost effectiveness analysis as well as the formula for calculating the total benefits has been developed. The efforts underway in Gloucester could easily be adopted for use by other local programs.

Computer-Assisted Data Collection - Anchorage, Alaska is presently installing computers at both the district level

and local building site level to collect and share data. Anchorage recently received a report prepared by a consulting firm on the kind of data which could be stored for community school programs. The use of computer-assisted data collection and analysis will surely be a trend worth future investigation by any number of local programs.

Role Development And Change Information - Tucson Unified School District in Tucson, Arizona presently collects data on role development and role change related to school principals, teachers, students, parents and agency personnel. The information is included in two narrative sections of the quarterly reports which are completed on the program. The one page summary sheets enable the community educator to document the development of and change in roles for the various identified groups.

Curriculum Enrichment Support Services - Five programs compile data related to curriculum enrichment. Salem Community Schools in Salem, Oregon, as an example, collects data in each of the following areas: 1) field trips (number filled vs. requested), 2) number of classroom volunteers, 3) number of resource persons, 4) resource materials development, 5) number of intern/practicum students and 6) number of room parents.

Kind Of Volunteer Involvement - Eight programs collect data on the kind of volunteer activities made available through community education efforts. Many of these opportunities

are listed in annual reports in a variety of different formats.

Historical Financial Analysis - Seven programs maintain longitudinal financial data for comparative purposes. One example is the Birmingham Community Education and Community Services Program in Birmingham, Michigan. This information is included in the annual report in both statistical and narrative fashion. One unique feature of the Birmingham report is the inclusion of financial information on all grant applications submitted to various sources over the past five years and a list of all contributions which have been received at the local level. The fifteen page historical financial data plan may be a model from which others could benefit.

Electric Energy Useage - Three programs indicated the collection of data related to electrical consumption. Brockton Community Schools in Brockton, Massachusetts and Gloucester County, Virgina both have formulas for such computations. A recent article by Outman and Cox (1981) in the Community Education Journal also offers a formula for arriving at such data.

Dollar Value of Volunteer Efforts - Six programs reported collecting data on the total dollar value of volunteer contributions. The Kanawha County Community Education Program in Charleston, West Virginia uses a five dollar per hour figure for volunteer contributions. Monthly reports are filed for each community education center.

Impact Data - Nine programs reported impact data of various sorts. There was no common element other than personal narrative success stories that proved to be a common thread. One unique approach has been taken by the Birmingham, Michigan program. The program included a list of "assets" of community education and corresponding page numbers which explain each of these assets in their annual report. The Gloucester County program presently calculates benefits derived from community education efforts in terms of a) publicity dollars, b) volunteer dollars c) facility rental savings and d) equipment savings. The Salem program calculates a "service" indicator based upon the number of filled and unfilled requests for services for each attendance area. Salem and three other programs also include a narrative on how community needs are being met by the program goals and objectives. Both Salem and Gloucester also record the number of contact hours with other agencies as a part of their data collection.

Council Effectiveness Data - Five programs collect data in various ways on council effectiveness. Roseville Community Schools in Roseville, Minnesota includes both council evaluation of the organization as well as assessment of their own effectiveness.

Goal/Objective Accomplishment - Eleven programs reported various methods for recording the accomplishment of objectives. Perhaps the most detailed data is presently collected by Salem, Oregon. Each attendance site records 1) the number

of objectives developed, 2) the number of objectives accomplished 3) the percentage of objectives accomplished per site and by the overall district, and 4) written narratives by each site on the manner each objective was accomplished or the reason for the lack of completion. All of the information is compiled in the annual report presented to the board.

Unique Data Collection - Among the more uncommon areas in which present community education programs are collecting data are the following:

1. number of volunteers involved with other agencies
2. longitudinal data on staff size
3. number of agencies involved in community needs assessments
4. consumable and non-consumable supplies inventory
5. impact of knowledge of the local neighborhood on the program
6. role change and development data
7. skills attempted/skills remediated by participants data.

C. Future Data Needs

Two-hundred and forty-one (241) data items were listed in the future data needs questionnaire mailed to participating program administrators. Fifty-six (56) data items or twenty-three percent (23%) received a mean score of 4.00 or better (1-5 scale). On the other hand, only ten (10) data items or four percent (4%) received a total mean score of below 3.00. The

rating scale was as follows:

5 - survival data (must collect)
4 - highly important (would like to collect)
3 - useful
2 - of little importance
1 - superficial.

The highest priority data items are listed below in Table 9 followed by the highest data items in each of the major categories (Tables 10-16) on the following pages.

COMMUNITY EDUCATION DATA PROFILE:

HIGHEST PRIORITIES OF FUTURE DATA NEEDS

Table 9

Data Item	Mean Score
Grand total number of participants	4.92
Number agencies/organizations using school facilities	4.79
Local funding sources/awards	4.79
Total number of programs	4.71
Total number of volunteers	4.71
District goal/objective accomplishment	4.71
Local attendance site goal/objective accomplishment	4.64
Council data (general)	4.55
Number of programs sponsored by other agencies	4.50
List of cooperating agencies	4.50
Other funding sources/amounts	4.50
Total volunteers by each local site	4.50

COMMUNITY EDUCATION DATA PROFILE:

FUTURE DATA ITEMS WITHIN PARTICIPATION CATEGORY

Table 10

Participation Data Item	Mean Score
Grand total number of participants	4.92
Total number of participants in non-school sponsored activities in school buildings	4.29
Total hours of participation	4.21
Total participation/contact hours	4.14
Grand total number of participants by age categories	4.07
Grand total number of participants by attendance areas	4.00

COMMUNITY EDUCATION DATA PROFILE:

FUTURE DATA ITEMS WITHIN ACTIVITIES CATEGORY

Table 11

Activities Data Item	Mean Score
Total number of programs	4.71
Number of programs by other agencies	4.50
Total number of programs	4.07
by co-sponsored agencies	4.07
by educational	4.07
by recreational	4.00
by cultural	4.00
by community instructional services	4.00

COMMUNITY EDUCATION DATA PROFILE:

FUTURE DATA ITEMS WITHIN INVOLVEMENT CATEGORY

Table 12

Involvement Data Items	Mean Score
Number of agencies/organizations using school facilities	4.79
Total number of volunteers	4.71
Council data (general)	4.55
List of cooperating agencies	4.50
Total volunteer workers by each local site	4.50
Number of participants in other agency sponsored activities	4.36
Number of classroom volunteers	4.36
Number of initiated inter-agency projects	4.29
Number of classroom resource people	4.21
Average number of volunteers per local site	4.21

COMMUNITY EDUCATION DATA PROFILE:

FUTURE DATA ITEMS WITHIN FINANCIAL CATEGORY

Table 13

Financial Data Items	Mean Score
Local funding sources & amounts	4.79
Other funding sources & amounts	4.50
Total operating expenses	4.43
Total cost of community education by site	4.14
Dollar value of volunteer hours	4.14
Total revenue by site	4.07
Net cost per site	4.07
Total expense/income by program or activity areas	4.00

COMMUNITY EDUCATION DATA PROFILE:

FUTURE DATA ITEMS WITHIN PROGRAM SUPPORT CATEGORY

Table 14

Program Support Data Item	Mean Score
District goal/objective accomplishments	4.71
Local program site goal/objective accomplishments	4.64
Number of designated community schools	4.29
State or federally requested data	4.14
Number of objectives of local site and percentage of accomplishment	4.14
Results from specific target group assessed needs	4.00

COMMUNITY EDUCATION DATA PROFILE:

FUTURE DATA ITEMS WITHIN ENVIRONMENTAL CATEGORY

Table 15

Environmental Data Item	Mean Score
Number of trained directors	4.15
Community school attendance area demographic information	4.00
Actions taken to increase awareness of community education	4.00
Policy support information	3.93

COMMUNITY EDUCATION DATA PROFILE:

FUTURE DATA ITEMS WITHIN IMPACT CATEGORY

Table 16

Impact Data Item	Mean Score
Increased use of community resource people and materials in regular school	4.21
Reduction in agency duplication of services	4.07
Improved community problem solving capacity	3.93
Increased decision-making in school by community members	3.93
Improved attitude of teachers/administrators toward role of community in education	3.93

In addition to the preceding tables, an analysis was undertaken to determine the grand mean scores of all items listed within the major categories for comparative purposes discussed in the next section. This information is continued in Table 17.

COMMUNITY EDUCATION DATA PROFILE:

GRAND MEAN SCORES OF FUTURE DATA NEEDS BY CATEGORY

Table 17

Major Category	Grand Mean
Program Support	4.02
Involvement	3.954
Financial	3.952
Impact	3.65
Activities	3.60
Programs	3.57
Environment	3.42

Tables 18-22 reflect the highest data items which could be associated with the "components" of community education. Items are cross listed where appropriate.

COMMUNITY EDUCATION DATA PROFILE:

FUTURE DATA NEEDS - EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR SCHOOL AGE CHILDREN

Table 18

Data Item	Mean Score
Number of classroom volunteers	4.36
Number of resource people	4.21
Impact data on increased use of community resource people and materials in regular school	4.21

COMMUNITY EDUCATION DATA PROFILE:

FUTURE DATA NEEDS - USE OF FACILITIES

Table 19

Data Item	Mean Score
Number of agencies/organizations using school facilities	4.79
Total number of participants in non-school sponsored activities in school building	4.29

COMMUNITY EDUCATION DATA PROFILE:

FUTURE DATA NEEDS - PROGRAM FOR ALL AGES

Table 20

Data Item	Mean Score
Grand total number participants	4.92
Total number of programs	4.71
Total hours of participants	4.21
Grand total number participants by age categories	4.07
Total number of programs by education	4.07

COMMUNITY EDUCATION DATA PROFILE:

FUTURE DATA NEEDS - COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Table 21

Data Item	Mean Score
Total number of volunteers	4.71
Local programs site goal & objective accomplishment	4.64
Council data (general)	4.55
Total volunteer workers by each local site	4.21
Average number volunteers per site	4.21
Number classroom volunteers	4.36
Number resource people	4.21

COMMUNITY EDUCATION DATA PROFILE:

FUTURE DATA NEEDS - DELIVERY AND COORDINATION OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

Table 22

Data Item	Mean Score
Number agencies/organizations using school facilities	4.79
Number of programs by other agencies	4.50
List of cooperating agencies	4.50
Number of participants in other agency sponsored activities	4.36
Number of initiated interagency projects	4.29
Agency benefits (volunteer dollar amount)	4.14
Total number of programs co-sponsored with other agencies	4.07
Agency duplication of services	4.07

IV. DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

Present Data Collection

Discussion Item #1 : Range of Data Collection

A wide range of data appears to be collected by various local community education programs around the country. This is evident through the rather large number (208) of different data items that are presently collected on at least an annual basis and reported in the earlier findings. Part of the reason for such a wide range of items may be the nature of the primary funding agencies and community education itself. The very nature of community education lends itself to locally designed and controlled data collection procedures. Outside funding at both the state and federal level have recently imposed data collection procedures to add to the existing base of information collection.

Discussion Item #2: Emphasis by Category

Table 1 reveals a high emphasis placed by local programs on collecting data related to program support and community involvement. A review of the kind of data in these two major categories reveals a rather wide range of data collection underway. On the other hand, very little data of any significance appear to be collected in the impact category. This may be due in part to the relatively new nature of most community education efforts which may need to concentrate more on basic survival data. It may be due also to the

lack of assistance received in determining how impact data can be collected. While the financial category also doesn't reflect a wide range of data items, it should be pointed out that on closer examination (see Table 7), there is a common set of core data items which are presently collected by local programs. Also, the range of data in this category may not need to be as broad. Thus, the number of data items by itself can be misleading and analysis must rely upon both the breath of data collected and the frequency with which it is collected.

Discussion Item #3: Emphasis by Component

Table 2 indicated a high emphasis on collection of a wide range of data items related to the community education components particularly the components dealing with programs for all ages and community involvement. Over sixty percent (60%) of the data, which could be categorized, fell into one of these two major areas. Data items regarding the use of facilities were lowest; however, it may indeed not be necessary to collect a wide range of data in this area. Very little research beyond the work of the Mid-Atlantic Center (see Cook 1979, and Kaplan, et al., 1980) has been done on the detailed data which should even be collected in each of these component areas. If data are not being collected in sufficient detail in each of these areas it may reflect a greater need of the community education field to clearly address itself to these components for data collection.

Discussion Item #4: Profile of Community Data

Table 3 illustrates the kind of data most commonly collected among the participating programs. A closer look at the data items reveals a high emphasis upon programming, participation and financial data. Table 3 represents a profile of baseline survival data which is not only collected by over seventy percent (70%) of the participating programs, but could also be a baseline for all local programs to consider.

Discussion Item #5: Profiles Within Categories

Tables 4-8 represent the most commonly collected data within categories. Local programs would be wise to consider how they compare to each of these tables. There appears to be little or no data on impact of the environment. There are some cautions which should be noted. In several instances data items listed in other major categories could be considered a part of one of these two categories. This is particularly true if one looks at the program support items and relates these items to the environmental category. Several items dealing with inter-agency relationships could also be linked to the impact category. Still the lack of any data items in the impact category is discouraging for those who wish to draw any conclusions about hard data related to the impact of community education. Various social service fields have had difficulty in arriving at approaches to truly measure the impact of the program. Community education is no exception.

Discussion Item #6: Data Examples

Several excellent examples of data collection in specific areas have the potential for serving as models for other local programs. Gloucester County's cost-benefit analysis and Salem's objectives verification process are two such examples. Birmingham's annual report as well as those from several other programs deserve to be shared with local program administrators. Simply, the sharing of information by local program administrators of what kind of information they collect and how it is used and reported merits investigation. On the other hand, there also appears to be a large amount of superficial data that may be of questionable value. Gansneder et al. (1980) have noted that the variety and magnitude of community education's goals may be contributing to an inability to come to consensus on the kinds of questions and corresponding data which should be collected. Failure to set boundaries on the information system does appear to be a problem with which community educators have yet to come to grips.

Discussion #7: Overall Strength and Weakness of the Data Collected

The overall strength of the data collected by the participating programs includes a good emphasis in each of the following areas:

..volunteer hours/volunteers
..activities and programs
..interagency documentation
..variety of council data
..total participation/contact hours
..financial data
..goals/objectives documentation
..participant evaluation data.

The program administrators themselves expressed a positive response to the study and a willingness to provide data as well as to return questionnaires. Several commented on the desire to obtain information in specific areas or obtain copies of annual reports for review.

On the other hand, a major weakness among programs would appear to be the lack of an overall system or approach for establishing a data base of information. Much of the information presently collected could be termed summative data used for reporting purposes almost exclusively. Perhaps greater attention needs to be directed toward answering the following questions for future collection efforts as Gansneder et al. (1980) have noted.

1. What kinds of decisions need to be made by whom, about what?
2. What particular topics are of high priority?
3. At what point in time is information needed?
4. What constraints and limitations should be imposed upon this system?

Future Data Collection

Discussion Item #8: Highest Data Items

Twelve items received a score of 4.5 or high regarding the importance of future data collection. This core group of data items is very similar to those presently collected by programs (see Tables 9 and 3). The items once again reflect an emphasis upon participation, programing, financing and

agency relationships. One item dealing with the development and verification of local attendance site goals/objectives deserves special note. If program administrators do wish to place greater emphasis on this area then model efforts such as those in Salem, Oregon need to be shared with others.

Discussion Item #9: Data Items Within Categories Again, many of these same items are listed as presently being collected (Tables 5-8). However, several items listed on these future needs did not appear with the same degree of significance in the present data study. As mentioned above, the development of local site goals/objectives is one such example. Several others also merit closer attention. Most notably are the following:

..data on classroom volunteers and resource people

..data on the dollar value of volunteer hours

..the cost of community education per site

..average number of volunteers at the local site

..data on local site demographics

..impact data on increased use of community resource people and materials in the regular school

..impact data on reduction in agency duplication of services.

Future data collection efforts appear to place an increasing emphasis upon both the development and use of data at the local attendance site level as well as data related to the regular school program.

Discussion Item #10: Overall Data Emphasis

The findings illustrated in Table 17 indicate a strong, continued effort in the collection of data items most often associated with program support, involvement and financing. Impact data follows these categories but rates above others. The collection of impact data would appear to be a stronger emphasis for future data collection.

Discussion Item #11: Components Emphasis

Tables 18-22 represent the findings associated with the components of community education. The lack of items in Tables 18-19 dealing with the K-12 program and use of facilities may in part be a result of biases in the design of the questionnaire itself. The questionnaire was not designed specifically around these component areas. The length of the questionnaire (241 data items) was already exceedingly long. Any attempt to develop an expanded list of items within these categories would have meant an unmanageable number of items. Still, Table 18 does suggest a future interest in collection of data related to the classroom. Data related to programming for all ages, community involvement and the coordination services do suggest a profile worth reviewing and referencing at the local level. However, further extensive research with regard to data items in the major components of community education should be undertaken before attempting

to generalize the findings. Instruments could be developed for determining the kind of data presently collected for each of the components if it were deemed appropriate. However, there is a danger in viewing these components as separate items.

Discussion Item #12: Relationship Between Present Data Collection and Future Needs

By far the majority of top priority items presently collected by local programs were also viewed as important to collect in the near future. Tables 3 and 9 are strikingly similar. Of particular importance to note is the rather high mean score received for the top items regarding future data needs. There appears to be a core set of data items which are perceived as important to collect both now and in the future. Researchers and those working in institutions of higher education may want a different set of data priorities (perhaps those dealing with impact and the environment). One of the implications from this study is to point out the difficulties which no doubt will evolve from trying to develop a data collection system which can serve both local program needs and research needs. This does not mean that such a system cannot evolve but only that such efforts may take further study and analysis.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this report was to summarize present and future data profiled as they relate to community education. The following suggested recommendations are directed towards various constituents in the community education field.

To All Community Education Groups

1. It is not recommended that a sophisticated data base system be developed at this time. As Gansneder et al (1980) have noted elsewhere, any attempt to do so would likely incur low payoffs relative to costs. Results from this study would also indicate districts may not be prepared to undertake such a system anyhow. Further, there is little evidence to suggest that community educators deem such a system necessary in the future.
2. Community educators at all levels should attempt to share more often with others, present data collected within their domain.
3. An emphasis on data collection is likely to continue to grow. This does require that additional thinking and planning be done at all levels to determine specific immediate needs as well as longer range projects.

To Local Community Education Programs

4. Programs are encouraged to review their own efforts in data collection and compare them with the findings of this report.
5. Programs are also encouraged to review the following set of guidelines as outlined by Gansneder et al. (1980) concerning

their own data collection effort. Consider collecting data which:

a. concerns the most important goals or intended outcomes
b. concerns the most important activities
c. is needed by the grantor
d. is most needed by local persons, e.g. the advisory council, school systems, and local agencies
e. is accessible, relevant, reliable, and valid
f. concerns the most important target groups.

6. Programers need to take greater initiative and develop networking strategies in order to improve their knowledge of data presently being collected around the country. This also requires taking on a large share of the responsibility for exchanging information. This study indicated a high interest in follow up and involvement.
7. Programs are encouraged to seek further assistance from community education centers from around the country regarding data collection. Too often in the past, this has been seen as a rather low priority by both trainers and participants. Clearly, the implications from the collection or lack of collection of data related to impact must be addressed. The political and economic conditions of our times will not let this major focus remain unresolved.

<u>To The Mid-Atlantic Center</u>

8. Every effort should be made to follow up this report with those programs which wished to be kept informed and involved. Among the possible options which should be considered are the following:

a. serve as a convenor or host center to enable the participating programs to share information with each other at workshops or conferences, (N.C.E.A. conference is one such example).

b. discuss directly with participating programs their ideas on the most useful follow up approaches to this study.

c. consider the development of one or more publications related to those model data examples listed in this study. The report would be a supplemental publication to this one and would enable programs to deal with the actual form with which present data is collected.

d. consider an additional nationwide search among LEAs in selected data items to incorporate with recommendation 8(c).

9. Longer range follow up recommendations include consideration of the following activities.

a. Investigate the development of specific data collection instruments related to the components of community education. This could be done by building off the existing work of Cook (1979,a,b,c) and outlined in Kaplan et al., (1980). Three of those component areas (facility use, interagency relationships and citizen participation) have already resulted in a list of subareas. Local programs would need to be involved heavily in this effort to insure the data is related to local needs as well.

b. Investigate the development of specific instruments in the two impact areas rated highest in this study. These two items were i)measuring impact on the K-12 program and ii)measuring impact on agency reduction in duplication of services. Such development and field testing again should be done with close coordination at the local level.

c. Assist a selected number of LEAs in the design of an overall data base system. This would also entail training and follow up tailored to local data collection efforts with research, planning and evaluation similar to the conceptual framework outlined by Decker & Burbach (1978). The work of Gansneder et al. (1980) could also serve as an excellent planning and reference guide.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Atkinson, Malcolm "Progress in Documentation: Database Systems", Journal of Documentation. March, 1979.

Bearley, William "Non-Procedural Languages For Information Resource Management". Paper presented at the International Meeting of Exchange, January 30, 1979.

Bina, James et al. Databases and Clearinghouses: Information Resources for Education. Columbus, Ohio - National Center For Research in Vocation Education, The Ohio State University, 1978.

Cook, Nancy Citizen Participation Issues - Research in Community Education. Charlottesville, Virginia: Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education, University of Virginia, 1979(a).

Cook, Nancy Facility Use Patterns - Research in Community Education. Charlottesville, Virginia: Mid- Atlantic Center For Community Education, University of Virginia, 1979(b).

Cook, Nancy Interagency Relationships - Research In Community Education. Charlottesville, Virginia: Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education, University of Virginia, 1979(c).

Date, C. J. An Introduction To Database Systems. Reading,Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing,Third Edition, 1981.

Decker, Larry & Harold Burbach Planning and Assessment in Community Education. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1978.

Developmental Associates, Inc. "Local Data Monitoring Form". Washington, D.C.: U.S.O.E., 1979.

Gansneder,Bruce et al. An Assessment of Research Needs in Community Education. Charlottesville, Virginia: Bureau of Educational Research, University of Virginia, 1980(a).

Gansneder, Bruce et al. Toward A Data Base For Community Education: An Exploratory Design. Charlottesville, Virginia: Mid-Atlantic For Community Education, University of Virginia, 1980 (b).

Hammond, Robert "Establishing Priorities For Information and Design Specifications For Evaluating Community Education Programs" in Community Education Perspective. Mike Kaplan and John Warden (editors) Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1978.

Kaplan, Mike, Gansneder, Bruce, Rochen, Barbara "An Agenda For Research in Community Education: Some Recent Findings and A Few Suggestions". Paper presented at N.C.E.A. convention, December 3-5, 1980.

Minzey, Jack, LeTarte, Clyde Community Education From Program To Process To Practice. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing, 1979.

Moore, Samuel "Community Education: Package Plan Vs. A Quest For Quality", Community Education Journal. January-February, 1974.

Outman, Robert, Cox, Paul "How To Calculate Electric Utility Costs". Community Education Journal, July, 1981.

Schwartz, Terry et al. A Third Party Evaluation Of The Kanawha County (W.VA.) Community Education Program: Executive Summary. Charlottesville, Virginia: Mid-Atlantic Center For Community Education, University of Virginia, 1980.

Van Voorhees, Curt "Community Education Needs Research For Survival", Phi Delta Kappan. November, 1972.

Warden, John A Critique of Toward A Data Base For Community Education: An Exploratory Design. Anchorage, Alaska: The Northern Institute & Development, unpublished monograph, 1981.

Weaver, Donald & Maurice Seay "Research in Community Education" in Community Education: A Developing Concept. Maurice Seay (editor). Midland, Michigan: Pendel Publishing Company, 1974.

Whitt, Robert "Accountability, Commitment and the Community School", Community Education Journal, February, 1971.

APPENDIX

A. Matrix On Information Presently Collected At The Local Level

B. Results Of Future Data Priorities Questionnaire

C. A List Of Cooperating L.E.A. Projects In The Data Base Study

D. Sample Letter Of Invitation To LEAs

E. Follow Up Letter To LEAs

F. Sample Letter Regarding Future Data Needs To LEAs

APPENDIX A

TOWARD A COMMUNITY EDUCATION DATA BASE:

INFORMATION PRESENTLY COLLECTED AT THE LOCAL LEVEL

A Matrix of Local Programs and Data
Revised

Participation

DATA	Local Programs																Total No. of Responses	Percentage of Respondents	17
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16			
Grand total number of participants	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	17	100	X
a) by sex	X	X			X	X				X	X		X				7	41	
b) by age categories	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X			X	14	82	X
c) by attendance areas	X		X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	14	82	X
d) by education		X			X						X						3	18	
e) by parent/non-parent		X									X		X				3	18	
f) by distance from school		X									X						2	12	
g) by race					X						X		X				3	18	
h) by other geographical data										X			X				2	12	
i) by previous participation					X					X			X				4	24	
Total number of participants in non-school sponsored activities in school buildings			X			X			X	X							5	29	X
Total hours								X		X	X		X	X		X	7	14	X
Average participant hours								X		X	X			X			5	29	X

Participation

DATA	Local Programs																Total No. of Responses	Percentage of Respondants	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16			17
Total participation/contact hours	X					X	X	X			X	X	X				8	47	X
Weekly average participation		X				X											3	18	X
Participation hours by type of program						X					X		X	X			5	29	X
Longitudinal data comparing annual years participation					X	X		X			X		X	X		X	8	47	X
Individual activity rosters	X		X	X	X	X		X							X	X	9	53	X

DATA	Local Programs																Total No. of Responses	Percentage of Respondants	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16			17
Total number of programs	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	17	100	X
a) credit/non-credit		X		X	X	X				X	X			X		X	9	53	X
b) recreational				X		X		X		X	X		X	X		X	5	29	
c) cultural				X		X		X		X	X			X		X	7	41	
d) educational			X	X	X	X		X		X	X		X	X		X	10	59	
e) community instructional services					X									X			3	18	X
f) co-sponsored agency program			X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X		X		X	11	65	X
g) enrichment				X		X	X				X		X	X		X	7	41	
h) special events			X	X		X	X		X	X				X		X	9	53	X
i) health			X					X		X	X			X		X	6	35	
j) skill								X						X		X	3	18	
k) social				X				X						X		X	5	29	
l) civic improvement								X			X			X			3	18	
m) self improvement								X		X				X			3	18	
n) religious											X						1	6	
o) reimbursable classes																X	2	12	X
p) non-reimbursable classes																X	2	12	X

Activities

Activities

DATA	Local Programs 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total No. of Responses	Percentage of Respondants	17
q) continuing programs (not classes)							X				X			X		X	5	29	X
r) number of students in remediation programs																X	2	12	X
Number of programs by other agencies						X			X	X	X	X		X		X	8	47	X
Frequency of programs		X				X				X	X			X			6	35	X
Most successful program (listed)						X	X										2	12	
List of community school instructors names, addresses				X	X	X				X					X	X	7	41	X
Weekly program number totals and participants						X									X	X	4	24	X
Number of cancelled activities	X				X			X		X						X	5	29	
Individual course outlines			X													X	3	18	X
Class meeting days			X	X		X				X	X		X	X		X	9	53	X
Number of meetings for each activity			X	X			X	X		X	X		X	X			9	53	X
Average number of participants each activity for each local site			X	X	X						X						5	29	X

Involvement

DATA	Local Programs																Total No. of Responses	Percentage of Respondants	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16			17
Total number of volunteers	X		X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X		X		X	11	65	
Kind of volunteer activities				X	X		X	X			X	X		X		X	8	47	
Total volunteer hours	X		X		X	X		X			X	X		X		X	9	53	
Total volunteer by each local site					X	X		X			X	X		X		X	7	41	
Council data		X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X		X		X	12	71	X
a) meeting dates		X	X	X	X	X	X			X				X			9	53	X
b) attendance figures		X	X	X		X	X				X	X		X		X	10	59	X
c) action and topics of meetings		X	X	X			X			X	X			X			8	47	X
d) role of staff				X	X									X			4	24	X
e) meeting time			X	X		X				X	X			X			7	41	X
f) location of meetings			X	X		X				X	X			X			7	41	X
g) manner of council selection				X		X					X						4	24	X
h) council strengths/problems						X	X					X					3	18	
i) council tasks/role						X					X			X			4	24	X
j) council member names etc.			X	X		X	X			X	X			X			8	47	X
k) staff attendance figures				X			X							X			3	18	
l) number of meetings				X			X			X	X			X		X	7	41	X

Involvement

DATA	Local Programs																Total No. of Responses	Percentage of Respondants	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16			17
m) evaluation of organization				X					X					X			3	18	
n) evaluation of effectiveness				X			X		X		X	X					5	29	
o) number of councils					X	X	X			X	X			X			7	41	X
p) advisory council profile				X							X	X				X	4	24	
q) narrative on involvement in objective development			X	X								X		X			5	29	X
Number of citizen workshops			X	X			X							X		X	5	29	
Average number of volunteers per local site				X	X	X					X	X		X			6	35	
Number of meetings/community participants			X	X		X	X				X			X			7	41	X
Curriculum enrichment support services provided (data)			X	X			X					X		X			5	29	
a) field trips (number filled vs. requested)			X	X								X					4	24	X
b) classroom volunteers			X	X			X				X	X		X			6	35	
c) resource people				X			X			X	X	X		X			7	41	X
d) resource materials				X								X		X			4	24	X
e) intern/practicum students			X	X								X					3	18	

Involvement

DATA	Local Programs 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	Total No. of Responses	Percentage of Respondants	17
f) room parents				X			X					X					3	18	
Number agencies/organizations using school facilities	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X		X	14	82	X
Number of participants in other agency sponsored activities	X	X			X	X	X			X	X	X		X		X	11	65	X
Narrative on inter-agency cooperative efforts	X	X	X				X										5	29	X
Agency attendance figures		X	X		X	X	X					X		X			8	47	X
Contact hours of facility use by other agencies			X	X			X			X	X	X		X			8	47	X
Number volunteers involved with other agencies												X		X			2	12	
Number of initiated interagency projects			X	X			X					X		X		X	6	35	
Agency involvement by types			X		X						X			X		X	6	35	X
List of cooperating agencies	X		X		X	X	X			X	X	X	X	X		X	12	71	X
Agency investments														X			1	6	
a) personnel dollar contributions														X			2	12	X
b) travel contributions														X			2	12	X
c) supplies											X			X			3	18	X

Involvement

DATA	Local Programs																Total No. of Responses	Percentage of Respondants	17
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16			
Staff involvement in councils, committees & projects							X										1	6	

	DATA	Local Programs																Total No. of Responses	Percentage of Respondants	
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16			17
Financial	Local funding sources and amounts	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X		X	X		X	13	76	X
	Other funding sources and amounts	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X			X		X	12	71	X
	Individual program dollar contributions			X				X	X					X	X			6	35	X
	Total operating expenses			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X			13	76	X
	Instructor cost for individual activities				X	X	X	X	X		X							8	41	X
	Other/material cost for individual activities					X		X	X		X				X			5	29	
	Total cost of community education by site			X		X	X	X	X		X			X	X		X	10	59	X
	Total revenue by site			X		X	X	X	X		X			X			X	9	53	X
	Net cost per site			X		X	X	X	X		X			X			X	9	53	X
	Total expense/income by program or activity areas						X		X	X	X			X				9	53	X
	Dollar value of volunteer hours			X	X		X						X		X		X	6	35	
	Monthly financial statements by individual sites																X	2	12	X
	Longitudinal financial data comparison					X	X	X	X				X		X			7	41	X

Financial

DATA	Local Programs																Total No. of Responses	Percentage of Respondants	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16			17
Longitudinal costs for publicity on annual basis										X						X	2	12	
Cost-benefit analysis					X	X						X		X			4	24	

Program Support

DATA	Local Programs																Total No. of Responses	Percentage of Respondants	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16			17
District goal/objective accomplishments	X	X	X		X	X	X			X		X		X		X	11	65	X
Local programs site goal and objective accomplishment	X		X		X	X				X	X	X		X		X	10	59	X
Number of objectives at local site and percentage of accomplishment			X	X								X					3	18	
Future goal listing			X	X		X	X							X		X	6	35	
Availability of facilities at each program site (data)																X	2	12	X
Facilities utilized			X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X		X		X	11	65	X
Electric energy useage						X								X			3	18	X
Narrative information on activities	X	X			X	X	X							X		X	8	47	X
a) related to K-12	X		X		X	X	X				X	X		X		X	10	59	X
b) inter-agency cooperation	X	X	X		X		X			X	X			X		X	10	59	X
c) community development	X				X		X					X		X		X	7	41	X
d) use of facilities and resources	X						X			X	X			X			6	35	X
e) youth activities	X		X		X		X			X	X			X			8	47	x
f) adult activities	X		X		X		X			X	X			X			8	47	X
Planning and evaluation narrative			X									X		X		X	5	29	X

Program Support

DATA	Local Programs																Total No. of Responses	Percentage of Respondants	17
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16			
Historical narrative on program			X			X	X			X				X			6	35	X
Narrative information on opportunities for improvement/problems		X	X				X	X				X					6	35	
Narrative information on anticipated action/future plans		X	X			X	X	X				X					6	35	
Narrative on actions taken to implement regional concept of community education			X		X									X			3	18	
Staff size			X	X		X				X	X	X		X			8	47	X
Staff numbers and costs			X	X		X	X			X				X		X	8	47	X
Staff hours			X	X		X				X				X			6	35	X
Staff development activities			X				X			X		X		X		X	7	41	X
Staff evaluation data			X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X		X		X	11	65	X
Longitudinal data on staff size												X		X			2	12	
Staff development priorities and listing												X		X			3	18	X
Needs assessment dates			X	X			X			X	X			X			6	35	
Number people surveyed			X	X			X			X	X			X			6	35	
Number returned assessments			X	X			X			X	X			X			6	35	
Number volunteer involvement in assessment				X			X					X		X			4	24	

Program Support

DATA	Local Programs																Total No. of Responses	Percentage of Respondants	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16			17
Number agency involvement in assessment							X							X			1	6	
Results from specific target group assessed needs		X	X	X	X	X											5	29	
a) volunteers		X	X			X					X						4	24	
b) teachers		X	X	X							X						4	24	
c) principals		X	X	X							X						4	24	
d) parent/community		X	X	X	X	X				X	X						7	41	
Participant evaluation data		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X						X	10	59	X
a) evaluation of instructor		X	X		X			X		X				X		X	7	41	
b) evaluation of activity		X	X		X			X		X				X		X	8	47	X
c) future programs		X			X			X		X	X			X		X	7	41	
d) method of learning about the program		X		X						X			X	X		X	6	35	
e) facilities evaluation								X								X	3	18	X
f) frequency of past participation										X						X	3	18	X
Type of communication/publicity			X	X			X			X	X					X	6	35	
List of public relations activities			X							X	X					X	4	24	
Newsletter dates			X	X		X	X			X				X			6	35	

Program Support

DATA	Local Programs																Total No. of Responses	Percentage of Respondants	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16			17
Total newsletters distributed			X	X		X	X			X	X			X			7	41	
Number of issues			X	X		X	X				X			X			6	35	
Registration sources				X		X				X				X		X	6	35	X
Registration times				X		X				X	X			X		X	7	41	X
Equipment inventory					X	X					X			X			4	24	
Consummable supplies						X								X			2	12	
Non-consummable supplies						X								X			2	12	
Number of designated community schools	X	X	X		X	X				X	X			X			9	53	X
Summary profile of local community school			X	X			X				X					X	6	35	X
State or federally requested data	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X		X			12	71	X

Environmental

DATA	Local Programs																Total No. of Responses	Percentage of Respondants	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16			17
Role change information		X															1	6	
a) principal		X					X										2	12	
b) teacher		X															1	6	
c) parents/community members		X															1	6	
d) students		X															1	6	
e) agencies		X															1	6	
Role development information		X															1	6	
a) principal		X					X										2	12	
b) teacher		X															1	6	
c) parents/community members		X															1	6	
d) students		X															1	6	
e) agencies		X															1	6	
Number of trained directors		X					X				X			X		X	6	35	X
Actions taken to increase awareness of community education			X		X		X		X	X				X			7	41	X
Impact of increase/decrease in school enrollments on program			X			X					X						3	18	
Impact of knowledge of neighborhood on program						X											1	6	

Environmental

DATA	Local Programs																Total No. of Responses	Percentage of Respondants	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16			17
Narrative changes in councils performance					X	X				X							3	18	
Personnel assessment of organization climate									X		X			X			3	18	
Number speeches/topics given							X							X		X	4	24	X
List of staff involvement with other organizations and councils			X		X		X							X		X	6	35	X
Receptivity of principal to school facility use by each site														X		X	2	12	
Special facilities needs																X	2	12	X
Number of requests received for service at each site											X	X					2	12	
Number of requests filled at each site											X	X		X			3	18	
Annual staff development plan with dates, and focus										X		X		X			4	12	X
Community school attendance area demographic information			X	X	X		X			X		X		X		X	9	53	X
Other information of special significance to individual attendance sites (% bussed students, % of free lunches, businesses)												X					1	6	
Number of contact hours with other agencies												X		X			2	12	

Environmental

DATA	Local Programs																Total No. of Responses	Percentage of Respondants	17
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16			
Prioritized issues internal to the program												X		X			2	12	

Impact

DATA	Local Programs																Total No. of Responses	Percentage of Respondants	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16			17
Narrative personal success stories		X								X				X		X	5	29	X
Adult special interest verification of competency data																X	1	6	
Skills attempted/skills remediated by participants					X												1	6	
Perception of impact of community school							X							X			2	12	
Human interest stories														X		X	3	18	X
Narrative on community needs being met by program goals and objectives			X	X								X		X			4	24	
Number of teens employed via Rent-A-Teen				X								X		X			3	18	
Agency benefits														X			1	6	
a) publicity dollars														X			1	6	
b) volunteer dollars														X			1	6	
c) facility rental savings														X			1	6	
d) equipment savings														X			1	6	
Total agency dollar benefits														X			1	6	
User investments														X			1	6	
Number of requests for services filled												X					1	6	

APPENDIX B

Toward a Community Education Data Base: Future Priorities at the Local Level

Listed below is a wide range of information which could be a part of future data collection at the local level. Please read each item and decide upon the degree of importance of collecting this kind of information to assist your own local efforts. Include both the priority areas you presently collect data and wish to continue, as well as areas you presently do not collect data but believe are important future priority areas for your program. Please check all items on this list according to the rating scale on the right side of the paper. Return questionnaire by August 9, 1981 to: John Warden, The Northern Institute, 650 West International Airport Road, Anchorage, Alaska 99502. Thank you for your help.

Degree of Importance to Collect this Data
(check one response for each item)

Data Item	Survival Data (must collect) (5)	Highly Important (would like to collect) (4)	Useful (3)	Of Little Importance (2)	Superficial (1)	M.S*
Grand total number of participants	11	1				4.92
a) by sex	2	4	6	2		3.43
b) by age categories	5	5	4			4.07
c) by attendance areas	5	4	5			4.00
d) by education level		4	4	4	1	2.85
e) by parent/non-parent	1	4	8	1		3.29
f) by distance from school		1	9	4		2.79
g) by race		2	7	3	2	2.64
h) by other geographical data		2	6	4	2	2.57
i) by previous participation		3	10	1		3.14
Total number of participants in non-school sponsored activities in school buildings	6	6	2			4.29
Total hours of participation	7	3	4			4.21

*Mean Score

Data Item	Survival Data (must collect) (5)	Highly Important (would like to collect) (4)	Useful (3)	Of Little Importance (2)	Superficial (1)	M.S.*
Average participant hours	2	5	4	3		3.43
Total participation/ contact hours	5	5	3			4.14
Weekly average participation	4	3	4	3		3.57
Participation hours by type of program	2	6	5	1		3.64
Longitudinal data comparing annual years participation	5	4	4	1		3.93
Individual activity rosters	3		8	2	1	3.14
Total number of programs	11	2	1			4.71
a) by credit/non-credit	6		5	2	1	3.57
b) by recreational	7	1	5	1		4.00
c) by cultural	7	2	3	2		4.00
d) by educational	7	3	2	2		4.07
e) by community instructional services	3	5	4	2		4.00
f) by co-sponsored agencies	5	5	4			4.07
g) by enrichment	4	3	6	1		3.71
h) by special events	4	3	7			3.79
i) by health	3	4	6			3.64
j) by skill	3	3	7	1		3.57
k) by social	4	4	5	1		3.79
l) by civic improvement	3	5	5	1		3.71
m) by self-improvement	3	3	7	1		3.57
n) by religious	1	2	6	4	1	2.86
o) by non-reimbursable classes	2	1	4	5	1	2.85
p) by reimbursable classes	4		4	4	1	3.15

*Mean Score

Data Item	Survival Data (must collect) (5)	Highly Important (would like to collect) (4)	Useful (3)	Of Little Importance (2)	Superficial (1)	M.S.*
q) by continuing programs (not classes)	4	3	4	3		3.57
r) by number of students in remediation programs	4	2	5	3		2.50
s) by work related	2	3	5	4		3.21
t) by basic education attainment	1	3	8	2		3.21
Number of programs by other agencies	8	5	1			4.50
Frequency of programs	4	3	6	1		3.71
Most successful program (listed)	2	3	6	1	2	3.14
List of community school instructors' names, addresses	5	4	2	2	1	3.71
Weekly program number totals and participants	4	1	4	4	1	3.21
Number of cancelled activities	5	5	2	2		3.93
Individual course outlines	2	1	7	3	1	3.00
Class meeting days	5	2	4	3		3.64
Number of meetings for each activity	6	2	3	2		3.92
Average number of participants each activity for each local site	2	6	4	2		3.57
Total number of courses for mentally handicapped	1	4	8		1	3.29
Total number of courses for physically handicapped	1	4	8		1	3.29
Total number of courses for limited English speakers		6	6	1	1	3.21
Total number of volunteers	11	2	1			4.71
Kind of volunteer activities	5	7	2			4.21

*Mean Score

Data Item	Survival Data (must collect) (5)	Highly Important (would like to collect) (4)	Useful (3)	Of Little Importance (2)	Superficial (1)	M.S.*
Total volunteer workers by each local site	10	2	1	1		4.50
Council data	7	3	1			4.55
a) meeting dates	4	5	5			3.93
b) attendance figures	6	4	3	1		4.07
c) action and topics of meetings	6	4	4			4.14
d) role of staff	4	4	6			3.86
e) meeting time	4	3	5	2		3.64
f) location of meetings	4	3	6	1		3.71
g) manner of council selection	6	3	4	1		4.00
h) council strengths/ problems	3	6	5			3.86
i) council tasks/role	4	7	3			4.07
j) council member names, etc.	4	5	3	2		3.79
k) staff attendance figures	3	5	3	3		3.57
l) number of meetings	5	2	7			3.86
m) evaluation of organization	5	3	6			3.93
n) evaluation of effectiveness	6	3	5			4.07
o) number of councils	6	2	6			4.00
p) advisory council profile	2	7	4	1		3.71
q) narrative on involvement in objective development	3	5	5	1		3.71
Number of citizen workshops	4	2	7	1		3.64
Average number of volunteers per local site	7	4	2	1		4.21

*Mean Score

Data Item	Survival Data (must collect) (5)	Highly Important (would like to collect) (4)	Useful (3)	Of Little Importance (2)	Superficial (1)	M.S.*
Number of meetings/community participants	5	3	6			3.93
Curriculum enrichment support services provided (data)	7	1	5			4.15
a) field trips (number filled vs. requested)	3	5	4	2		3.64
b) classroom volunteers	8	4	1	1		4.36
c) resource people	6	6	1	1		4.21
d) resource materials	3	6	4	1		3.79
e) intern/practicum students	4	3	4	3		3.29
f) room parents	4	2	5	3		3.50
Number agencies/organizations using school facilities	12	1	1			4.79
Number of participants in other agency sponsored activities	8	3	3			4.36
Narrative on interagency cooperative efforts	6	3	5			4.07
Agency attendance figures	7	1	5	1		4.00
Contact hours of facility use by other agencies	8	1	4	1		4.14
Number volunteers involved with other agencies	1	7	4	2		3.50
Number of initiated interagency projects	6	6	2			4.29
Agency involvement by types	3	5	6			
List of cooperating agencies	9	3	2			4.50
Agency investments	5	3	3	2		3.85
a) personnel dollar contributions	5	1	5	3		3.57
b) travel contributions	2	3	5	4		3.21
c) supplies	2	3	5	4		3.21

*Mean Score

Data Item	(5) Survival Data (must collect)	(4) Highly Important (would like to collect)	(3) Useful	(2) Of Little Importance	(1) Superficial	M.S.*
Local funding sources and amounts	12	1	1			4.79
Other funding sources and amounts	10	2	1	1		4.50
Individual program dollar contributions	6	2	4	2		3.86
Total operating expenses	10	2	2			4.43
Instructor cost for individual activities	3	4	6	1		3.36
Other/material cost for individual activities	2	5	6	1		3.57
Total cost of community education by site	5	6	3			4.14
Total revenue by site	5	6	2	1		4.07
Net cost per site	4	7	3			4.07
Total expense/income by program or activity areas	4	7	2	1		4.00
Dollar value of volunteer hours	6	4	4			4.14
Monthly financial statements by individual sites	2	3	7	2		3.36
Longitudinal financial data comparison	3	2	6	3		3.36
Longitudinal costs for publicity on annual basis	3	2	6	3		3.36
Cost-benefit analysis report	3	7	2	1		3.92
District goal/objective accomplishments	10	4				4.71
Local programs site goal and objective accomplishment	10	5				4.64
Number of objectives at local site and percentage of accomplishment	5	6	3			4.14

*Mean Score

Data Item	Survival Data (must collect) (5)	Highly Important (would like to collect) (4)	Useful (3)	Of Little Importance (2)	Superficial (1)	M.S.*
Future goal listing	4	7	3			3.57
Availability of facilities at each program site (data)	3	3	7			3.79
Listing of facilities utilized	3	4	7			3.71
Number of groups per week using facilities	2	5	5	2		3.50
Electric energy useage	3	3	6	1	1	3.43
Narrative information on activities	1	4	6	1		3.46
a) related to K-12	5	4	4	1		3.93
b) inter-agency cooperation	4	5	4	1		3.86
c) community development	3	5	5	1		3.71
d) use of facilities and resources	3	7	4			3.93
e) youth activities	3	4	7			3.71
f) adult activities	3	4	7			3.71
Planning and evaluation narrative	4	7	3			3.57
Historical narrative on program	4	1	8	1		3.71
Narrative information on opportunities for improvement/problems	1	5	7	1		3.43
Narrative information on anticipated action/future plans	1	5	7	1		3.43
Narrative on actions taken to implement regional concept of community education	1	4	6	3		3.21
Time of day facilities in use for activities	2	3	7	1		3.43

*Mean Score

Data Item	Survival Data (must collect) (5)	Highly Important (would like to collect) (4)	Useful (3)	Of Little Importance (2)	Superficial (1)	M.S.*
Staff size	6	2	4	2		3.86
Staff numbers and costs	5	3	4	2		3.79
Total staff hours	4	4	4	2		3.71
Staff development activities	3	4	6	1		3.64
Staff evaluation data	5	4	4	1		3.93
Longitudinal data on staff size	2	3	6	3		3.29
Staff development priorities and listing	4	4	5	1		3.79
Needs assessment dates	3	5	4	1		3.79
Number of people surveyed	5	4	4	1		3.93
Number returned assessments	5	4	4	1		3.93
Number volunteer involvement in assessment	4	3	7			3.79
Number agency involvement in assessment	5	3	6			3.93
Results from specific target group assessed needs	5	3	5			4.00
a) volunteers	3	6	5			3.86
b) teachers	4	5	5			3.93
c) principals	4	5	5			3.93
d) parent/community	4	4	5			3.93
Participant evaluation data	3	5	5			3.85
a) evaluation of instructor	3	6	4	1		3.79
b) evaluation of activity	3	5	5	1		3.71
c) future programs	3	5	5	1		3.71
d) method of learning about the program	2	4	8			3.57
e) facilities evaluation	2	4	7	1		3.50
f) frequency of past participation	1	1	11	1		3.14

*Mean Score

Data Item	(5) Survival Data (must collect)	(4) Highly Important (would like to collect)	(3) Useful	(2) Of Little Importance	(1) Superficial	M.S.*
Type of communication/ publicity	2	6	6			3.71
List of public relations activities	3	5	6			3.79
Newsletter dates	4	2	5	3		3.64
Total newsletters distributed	5	3	2	4		3.64
Number of Issues	5	2	3	4		3.57
Registration sources	3	4	3	4		3.43
Registration times	2	4	4	4		3.29
Equipment inventory	4	3	3	3		3.62
Consummable supplies	2	1	6	5		3.00
Non-consummable supplies	2	2	5	4		3.15
Number of designated community schools	9	1	3	1		4.29
Summary profile of local community school	5	4	4	1		3.93
State or federally requested data	7	2	5			4.14
Role change information		4	5	2		3.18
a) principal	2	4	5	2		3.15
b) teacher	1	5	5	2		3.38
c) parents/community members	1	5	5	2		3.38
d) students	1	5	5	2		3.38
e) agencies	1	6	4	2		2.46
Role development information		4	6	2		3.18
a) principal	2	4	5	2		3.46
b) teacher	2	4	5	2		3.46
c) parents/community members	1	5	5	2		3.38

*Mean Score

Data Item	Survival Data (must collect) (5)	Highly Important (would like to collect) (4)	Useful (3)	Of Little Importance (2)	Superficial (1)	M.S.*
d) students	1	5	5	2		3.38
e) agencies	1	5	5	2		3.38
Number of trained directors	6	3	4			4.15
Actions taken to increase awareness of community education	3	8	3			4.00
Policy support information	4	6	3	1		3.93
Impact of increase/ decrease in school enrollments on program		8	4	2		3.43
Impact of knowledge of neighborhood on program		8	5	1		3.50
Narrative changes in council's performance		3	11			3.21
Personnel assessment of organization climate		2	8	3	1	2.79
Number speeches/topics given	2	2	7	3		3.24
List of staff involvement with other organizations and councils	4	2	7	1		3.64
Narrative on receptivity of principal to school facility use by each site		5	6	3		3.14
Special facilities needs		3	11			3.21
Number of requests received for service at each site		6	7	1		3.36
Number of requests filled at each site		6	7	1		3.36
Annual staff development plan with dates, and focus	2	7	4	1		3.71
Community school attendance area demographic information	5	5	3	1		4.00

*Mean Score

Data Item	Survival Data (must collect) (5)	Highly Important (would like to collect) (4)	Useful (3)	Of Little Importance (2)	Superficial (1)	M.S.*
Other information of special significance to individual attendance sites (% bussed students, % of free lunches, businesses)	2	3	6	3		3.29
Number of contact hours with other agencies	1	5	5	3		3.29
Prioritized issues internal to the program	4	8	2			3.14
Written history of program	2	4	8			3.57
Narrative personal success stories	1	3	8	1		3.14
Adult special interest verification of competency data	1	1	6	6		2.79
Skills attempted/skills remediated by participants	3		5	5		3.07
Perception of impact of community school		6	7	1		4.21
Human interest stories	1	2	8	2	1	3.00
Narrative on community needs being met by program goals and objectives		7	7			3.50
Number of teens employed via Rent-A-Teen	3	1	3	6	1	2.93
Agency benefits	4	5	4			4.00
a) publicity dollars	5	3	5	1		3.86
b) volunteer dollars	4	5	4	1		4.14
c) facility rental savings	3	5	5	1		3.71
d) equipment savings	3	5	4	1		3.77
Total agency dollar benefits	4	6	3	1		3.93
User investments	2	5	5	2		3.50
Number of requests for services filled	1	7	5	1		3.57

*Mean Score

Impact Data in Following Areas	Survival Data (must collect) (5)	Highly Important (would like to collect) (4)	Useful (3)	Of Little Importance (2)	Superficial (1)	M.S.*
a) economic impact on the community	3	6	5			3.86
b) improved image of the school in the community	2	6	6			3.71
c) improved school-community communications patterns	3	6	5			3.86
d) improved community problem solving capacity	3	7	4			3.93
e) reduction in vandalism and crime	3	6	5			3.86
f) reduction in agency duplication of services	5	5	4			4.07
g) reduction in drop-out rates	1	7	3	2	1	3.36
h) improved energy efficiency systems	1	5	6	1	1	3.29
i) increased outreach services to the community	3	6	4	1		3.86
j) increased use of community resource people and materials in regular curriculum	8	1	5			4.21
k) increased local leadership development	3	8	3	1		3.86
l) broader vision of education in the community	2	4	7	1		3.50
m) improved attitude of teachers/administrators toward role of community in education	4	5	5			3.93
n) increased number of self-help community activities	1	3	9	1		3.29
o) increased decision making in school by community members	2	9	3			3.93

*Mean Score

Data Item	(5) Survival Data (must collect)	(4) Highly Important (would like to collect)	(3) Useful	(2) Of Little Importance	(1) Superficial	M.S.*
p) increased decision making in non-school organizations by community members	2	5	2	3	1	3.31
q) reduction of alcohol use		3	6	4		2.86
r) reduction in juvenile delinquency		4	7	3		3.07
s) improved cultural understanding		5	6	3		3.14
t) improved academic performance by students	2	7	3	2		3.64
u) increased awareness of community resources by community members	1	5	8			3.50
v) improved student attitude toward school	1	7	4	2		3.50
w) increased community-based instructional materials	1	4	7	2		3.29
x) increased student interaction with the community	1	5	7	1		3.43
y) Individual impact data		3	10	1		3.14
z) Increased enrichment opportunities for students	3	3	7	1		3.57
zz) Increased discretionary funds for teachers/ staff	2	4	5	3		3.36
Other						
Other						
Other						

Would you be interested in continuing with us next year to collect information for your local use as well as share with other local programs?

12 yes _____ no 2 undecided

_____
Name

_____

_____

_____
Address

Thank you - you made it!

APPENDIX C

Toward A Data Base For Community Education Among Local Programs

A List of Participating LEAs

Alaska

1. Jill Waters
   Anchorage Community Schools
   Municipality of Anchorage
   Pouch 6-650
   Anchorage, Alaska 99502

Arizona

2. Gene Weber
   Tucson Unified School District
   P.O. Box 404, 1010 E. 10th St.
   Tucson, AZ 85717

California

3. Katha Cochiot
   Cajon Valley Union School
   Cuyamaca Elementary School
   851 South Johnson Ave.
   El Cajon, CA 92020

4. Katie Elsbree
   Poway Unified School District
   14614 Garden Road
   Poway, CA 92064

Florida

5. John Zemlo
   Director of Community Education
   Alachua County Schools
   619 E. University Ave.
   Gainesville, FL 32601

Massachusetts

6. Harry Allen
   Brockton Community Schools
   43 Crescent Street
   Brockton, MA 02401

Michigan

7. Ms. Shirley Bryant
   Director of Community Education
   Birmingham Public Schools
   746 Purdy Street
   Birmingham, MI 48012

Minnesota

8. Arthur Ingersoll
   Assistant Director of Community Education
   St. Louis Park Schools
   6425 W. 33rd Street
   St. Louis Park, MN 55426

9. Jim Klassen
   Director of Community Education
   Roseville Schools
   1251 W. County Road B-2
   Roseville, MN 55113

Texas

10. Arlen Tieken
    Comal Independent School District
    Community Education
    1421 Highway 81 E
    New Braunfels, TX 78130

North Carolina

11. Joe Allred
    Director of Community Education
    Wilkes County Schools
    201 W. Main Street
    Wilkesboro, NC 28697

Oregon

12. William Liebertz
    Salem Public School
    Community Service and Public Information
    Post Office Box 12024
    Salem, Oregon 97301

South Carolina

13. David Staton
    Charles County School District
    3 Chisolm Street
    Charleston, South Carolina 29401

Virginia

14. Del Highfield
    Gloucester City Department
     of Community Education
    Gloucester, VA 23061

Washington

15. Jerry Dunlap
    Clover Park Administrative Services
    10020 Gravelly Lake Drive, S.W.
    Tacoma, WA 98499

West Virginia

16. Mary Francis Bleidt
    Kanawha County Community
     Education Program
    200 Elizabeth St.
    Charleston, WV 25311

Florida

17. Lou Tasse
    Department of Community Schools
    1410 N. E. Second Avenue
    Miami, Florida 33132

APPENDIX D

THE NORTHERN INSTITUTE

For

Research, Training and Development, Inc.

650 West International Airport Road • Anchorage, Alaska 99502

Phone (907) 274-3691

April 13, 1981

Harry Allen
Brockton Community Schools
43 Crescent Street
Brockton, MA 02401

Dear Harry:

This letter is to extend an invitation to you to join nineteen other local community education administrators from around the nation in an investigation of information and data needs of local community education programs. You have been selected due to your own extensive experience in community education and your proven leadership in the field.

The title of this project is "Toward A Data Base For Community Education Among Local Programs". The studying is a cooperative undertaking involving Mike Kaplan from the University of Virginia and myself at The Northern Institute. The purposes of the project are: 1) to examine and determine what specific information data is presently being collected by local community education programs, 2) to determine priority information which local programs would like to see collected on their program, 3) to develop instruments which can assist in those priority areas and 4) to determine ways of assisting local programs in the actual collection of the information. A more detailed description of the project is presently being written by Mike Kaplan and will be forwarded to you in the very near future.

We believe the benefits to you and your program will be as follows: 1) you will learn what other local programs are now doing with regard to the kind of information being compiled at the local level, 2) you will have an opportunity to provide direct input into helping identify data information which needs to be collected at the local level and 3) you will have an opportunity to review data instruments which will have direct application to the information needs identified.

Here's how we would like your help. First, I would like to receive from you a listing of the <u>kind</u> of data you presently collect on your program (e.g., number of activities, number of participants). If you do not have time to make up such a list, simply send a copy of all reports and other items in which this information can be found. I will compile a master matrix listing the kind of present information

An Equal Opportunity Employer

collected with each of the twenty local programs. This will then be sent back to you as a reference point for the second phase. We will then be asking you to review this information and answer the following critical question - "What are the priority data information needs which myself and other local community education programs should be collecting"? The third phase to the project will be determining ways this information can be collected and in the best form.

Please feel free to contact myself or Mike Kaplan if you have additional questions. By May 1st I would like to know if you are willing to assist us in this project. If so, could you please send to me by May 15 either a listing of the kind of information you collect on your program or actual reports from which I can glean the information to save you time.

I personally hope you will join Mike, myself and the other nineteen local program administrators who have been extended the invitation (attached). We believe this will be one case whereby helping us on this project you will be helping yourself.

Warmest,

John W. Warden

John Warden

Enclosure

APPENDIX E

THE NORTHERN INSTITUTE

For

Research, Training and Development, Inc.

650 West International Airport Road • Anchorage, Alaska 99502

Phone (907) 274-3691

June 10, 1981

Enclosed you will find a data base matrix I have developed based upon the information you and others have shared with me on present data collected at the local level. On one side is a listing of programs by number while the other side lists the kind of data presently collected by each program.

Now I need your help one step further. In compiling the matrix it came to my attention that many programs may indeed be collecting data that other programs sent me but either forgot to send the material or did not have the time to locate all the data. As a result, I would like your help in revising the matrix to more accurately reflect your actual present data base. On the attached matrix I have red lined your program. Would you please take a few minutes to review the matrix to see if I somehow need to revise your data information presently collected. However, this is not a contest to see which program can mark the most number of boxes! Rather, it is an attempt to enable you to give Mike Kaplan and myself a better picture of the kind of data you presently collect on at least an annual basis. We simply want to be able to report back to you on the "present state-of-the-art".

Please return the revised matrix to me by June 30th. I will then revise this material and send it back to you along with the next level of involvement. While it may appear to be a lot of paper pushing, already we have discovered some useful tools for data collection from a variety of programs. We will be sharing this with you along with getting your ideas on what kind of data you would like to be collecting in the future. But for now please help us out by taking a few minutes to review and revise the matrix as you see fit. If you have no suggested additions (boxes you feel should be checked) please also let me know that as well.

Thanks for your help on this matter.

Warmest:

John Warden

cc: Mike Kaplan

APPENDIX F

THE NORTHERN INSTITUTE

For

Research, Training and Development, Inc.

650 West International Airport Road • Anchorage, Alaska 99502

Phone (907) 274-3691

Gene Weber
Tucson Unified School District
P.O. Box 404
Tucson, AZ 85717

Dear Gene:

Enclosed you will find a revised data matrix based upon the feedback I have received from yourself and/or others. I have incorporated into it those changes which were recommended. I think it is fair to say that it represents the present state-of-the-art with regard to the kind of data presently being collected at the local level in community education among the sixteen programs who responded. I have also included several summary sheets which may help to draw attention to those data items you and others most frequently checked. The information has been helpful to Mike Kaplan and myself in determining the present status of data collected at the local level.

I would now like to ask for your cooperation in a second phase of the project which is designed to determine your perceptions of the kind of data which should be collected in the future. Some of this data will no doubt be the kind of information you and others presently collect. However, there may be other areas which have been uncovered in the matrix or enclosed questionnaire which lead you to believe a higher emphasis should be placed on data collection in these areas.

Enclosed you will find a questionnaire with a wide variety of data collection possibilities. Mike Kaplan and I would like to know which of these areas you feel are most important for future data collection. It is our intent to have you help us identify these data areas so we can target on the development of instruments and a support system to help local programs who might wish to then collect that data. As a result, your response to the enclosed questionnaire is both important and will help set the stage for later data collection efforts.

When reviewing the kind of data which could be collected in the future, we would like to ask you to consider the relative importance of that data to the following five key questions.

An Equal Opportunity Employer

1. Is this baseline survival data which must be collected for continued operation?

2. Is this highly important data to collect for your program?

3. Is this useful data but less important to collect?

4. Is this data of little importance?

5. Is this superficial data which should not be collected?

Please return the enclosed questionnaires with your response by no later than August 9. I will tabulate the results, share them with you and meet with Mike Kaplan to discuss follow up action for the coming year. If you would like to stay involved with this project, simply let us know on the attached questionnaire.

Thank you for your assistance.

Warmest,

John Warden

JW/kt

Enclosures: Revised Data Base Matrix
Questionnaire
Summary results of data base matrix

cc: Mike Kaplan